India

FOR THE

No. 91. New Series.] No. 185. Old Series.] WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1899. [Registered as a Newspaper. Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 153
India's Concern in the Present Crisis 156
Mr. Max Müller's Reminiscences ... 157
The People of India: Their many merits by many who have known them, by Alfred Webb 158
Mr. Hem Chandra Banerjea: Letter from Sir W. W. Hunter... 160
The Rangoon Outrage:
Acquittal of the Accused 160
Some Press Opinions 161
Notes from Bombay 162
The Danger in Afghanistan 163
The Indian Civil Service 163
Assault followed by Death 163
Advertisements 164

NOTES AND NEWS.

THERE seems to be no end to India's calamities and catastrophes. According to the latest reports seventy Indians, ten European children, and four adult Europeans lost their lives through the earthquake and landslips at Darjiling last Monday. The storm is said to have gathered at the head of the Bay of Bengal, to have swept over Northern Bengal, and to have burst with terrible fury at Darjiling, where twenty inches of rain fell in a day, accompanied by earthquake and landslips. The consequent loss of life and property, and the dislocation of business, are on an Oriental scale. We daily expect to be assured that the Congress and the Native Press are at the bottom of it all.

As we anticipated, the remaining four men of the West Kent Regiment on trial before the Sessions Court at Rangoon for an abominable outrage on a Burmese woman have been discharged. This result, as the Simla correspondent of the *Times* says, "adds one more to the surprises with which this astounding investigation has abounded." Whether the civil authorities propose to take any further action in the case does not yet appear; but the Simla correspondent of the *Times* says he "has good reason to believe that severe disciplinary action is contemplated at Army Headquarters." He sums up the matter thus:—

> On a comprehensive review of the case it is difficult to say whether the investigation has suffered more from the culpable remissness of the civil police in the initial stages, from the extraordinary apathy of the regimental authorities, or from freaks in legal interpretation, such as the decision of the cantonment magistrate that statements made before a military court of enquiry are not protected, or the not less extraordinary decision of the Recorder that officers who advise men suspected of an atrocious crime to confess the truth, pointing out simultaneously the penalty of guilt, are exercising an influence which renders the statements inadmissible as evidence. These vagaries in judicial interpretation will doubtless be set right by the authorities chiefly concerned; but the deplorable fact remains that an almost unparalleled combination of negligence and incompetence on the part of the investigating and judicial authorities has resulted in a gross miscarriage of justice.

This is certainly refreshing language from Simla to the *Times*, and it is not a whit too strong for the occasion.

The rider which the jury in Thorpe's case added to their verdict is extremely important. It runs thus:—

> The evidence proves clearly that the crime of rape was committed by a number of men of the West Kent Regiment. We exceedingly regret that sufficient evidence is not forthcoming to convict the guilty parties. The jury unanimously endorse the remarks made by the learned Recorder and the Government Advocate regretting that the evidence of Major Morse was not brought to the notice of the prosecution earlier.

Here, then, is a clear case in which an outrage has been committed and no conviction follows. In future it will not do for Lord Onslow and other official apologists to argue that the number of convictions is a sure guide to the number of offences.

That was an unfortunate syce that met his fate at the hands of a stud groom in the service of Lord Sandhurst on August 19. The groom was tried by Mr. Aston at Poona, with three assessors, on the two charges of causing death and causing simple hurt. Two of the assessors found the accused guilty, and the other found him not guilty, on both charges; so he got off with a fine of Rs. 25 on the charge of simple hurt. "But," as the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* says, "simple or not, the man died from its effects."

Our readers will remember the Vandelur shooting case, which resulted in the death of an Indian, and that Gunner Love was acquitted at the last Madras Sessions. He has been less fortunate before a court-martial. Tried on the charge of disobedience to General Orders, as he had apparently no shooting pass, he was found guilty and sentenced to eighty-four days' imprisonment with hard labour, but was recommended to mercy on the ground of his previous good character and of his having been detained for over four months in custody while awaiting his trial on the charge of causing the Indian's death. This sentence has been confirmed, but seventy days of the term have been remitted.

Possibly Mr. Ross now regrets that he was not satisfied with his own acquittal; for the remarks of the Magistrate, Captain Herbert, in dismissing the case against the seven villagers whom Mr. Ross prosecuted cannot have been pleasant to that individual. The Magistrate said:—

> So far as I can arrive at a conclusion, the main point in the case is the question as to whose land it was upon which the riot and assault is said to have been committed. From the evidence of Mr. Graham, which has been carefully given, it would appear that the land really belonged to the villagers.

This shows, as the *Bengalee* points out, that Ross "trespassed on land not his own, arrested villagers, and when they resisted, shot one of them in *self-defence*, and seriously wounded another." Can it then be doubted that his acquittal by a European jury was a miscarriage of justice?

It is worth while to trace in outline the progress of the distress in which Western India in particular has gradually become involved. On June 17—over four months ago—it was reported that the monsoon had set in quietly over Burma and over part of North-Eastern India and of the West Coast, and three days later it was "developing favourably." It was not till a month later (July 24) that a "partial failure" of the monsoon was stated to be "causing grave anxiety." While the rainfall had been "injuriously excessive" in Bengal, the North-West Provinces, and parts of Central India, "the Deccan, Berar, Gujerat, and a portion of the Central Provinces have been almost without rain during July," usually the wettest month. "The situation throughout Western India," wired Reuter's Bombay correspondent, "is already critical, and unless rain comes soon disaster is feared. A drinking-water famine in Kathiawar and elsewhere appears imminent." To like effect the Viceroy wired home on July 27. "Monsoon abnormal during past three weeks," he said, "but abnormal conditions will probably pass away very shortly." On August 1 the *Times* Simla correspondent struck a deeper note, stating that "much anxiety is felt by the Government of India," and that "the crops are withering rapidly over the greater part of the Deccan, Gujerat, Kathiawar, and some parts of the Konkan," and suffering in many other directions. On August 4, "over the whole Bombay Presidency the prospects of the season continue most unfavourable." On August 7 Reuter reported from Bombay "slight rain;" "the monsoon has again set in, though not strongly." August 14: "Rainfall somewhat more general in Madras, Central Provinces, and Bombay, but monsoon is still abnormally weak throughout India." August 16: "Crop prospects are most unsatisfactory;" in Gujerat and Kathiawar "cultivators are selling their cattle at two rupees a head." August 22: "North Bombay, Rajputana, South Punjab, and portions of Central India still rainless; monsoon, after improving, again weak." On August 24 Mr. Nugent stated in Council that "if things continued as they were at present the Government would have to face an exceedingly

disastrous situation." And on August 26 the Viceroy used the ominous word "famine."

On September 5 Lord Sandhurst stated at Poona that "the grim visitor famine was staring at them," and that while they hoped for September rains "meantime arrangements had been made to open relief works." The *Pioneer* (September 8) pointed out that the area affected by the failure of the monsoon this year "is nearly as wide as that affected in 1896-97;" and the same day Reuter reported that the Bombay Government was arranging on a large scale for the importation of fodder—a step "unknown in previous severe famines." On September 11, "welcome rains" were reported, there being a general fall of two to three inches in Western India. On September 16: "fairly general rain has materially improved the prospects in Haiderabad, Madras, Mysore, and Bombay Deccan, but in Punjab and Rajputana rainfall slight," and of course "prices are rising rapidly." On September 22, the Viceroy reported "famine relief given in Bombay, Rajputana, Central Provinces, Punjab;" and three days later it was wired from Simla that "owing to the gloomy reports regarding distress and famine it has been decided to curtail the proposed autumn tour" of the Viceroy, "and to omit Rajputana." Already therefore the people over a large part of India have been for some three months harassed by anxiety for the crops by the actual pressure of scarcity, and even famine. One must hope that the necessary precautions have been taken with no niggard hand.

In his statement on the Indian Budget (August 8: INDIA, p. 73, col. 2) Lord George Hamilton jubilantly drew special attention to the following infatuated contrast:—

> The first fact I wish to impress on the House is that this (Rx. 4,759,400) is the largest surplus ever realised in India in one year since our rule has been established there—(hear, hear)—but side by side with this fact there is another, scarcely less significant . . . . namely, that the year which preceded this surplus was the worst famine year of the century. The House will, I am sure, appreciate the significance of this juxtaposition of extreme depression and of exuberant recuperation, for it is the annihilation of the bleeding-to-death theory.

Of course Lord George drew the grateful "hear, hear" of his uninstructed supporters. But what have his instructed supporters in the Anglo-Indian Press to say? We quoted a few examples on September 1 and 8 (INDIA, pp. 114 and 124). The *Times of India* said "it seems easier at Whitehall to take a cheerful view of the prosperity of India than it does in the country itself," and adduced some very obvious and very serious reasons against Whitehall "jubilation." The *Pioneer* pulled a long face, and refused to be cheerful over the record surplus; in fact, it could not believe the report. It said:—

> What the taxpayer sees is that emergency taxes, allowed to be objectionable, and imposed as temporary, still remain in the system with every appearance of becoming permanencies; and to be told under these circumstances that a big surplus is a sign for congratulation and that it disproves the idea that India is being bled to death is in the nature of an aggravation rather than argument. . . . His lordship's robust optimism has led him into a good many questionable arguments before this, but we can hardly fancy him to have talked the nonsense pure and simple that the report would represent him to have talked.

Yet he had, and he will have to digest the friendly *Pioneer's* candid criticism as best he may. When the two foremost Anglo-Indian journals independently speak out in such terms, it is well worth the while of the British people at home to listen with all their ears.

We learn from the *Daily News* (September 27) that "operations are only now in progress at the India Office for providing a complete installation of electric light." A clearer and steadier light has certainly been much needed there for many a dreary day past.

Our hearty congratulations to the four Indian candidates who, in spite of the difficulties placed in their way, have succeeded in obtaining places in the Indian Civil Service at the last competitive examination. We wish they were more than four. So long as we profess to admit Indians to the government of their country on the same terms with Englishmen, it is an indefensible subterfuge to refuse to examine them in their own country. This year's list points the usual moral. The first of the successful candidates obtained 4,366 marks—the last 2,026. Will anybody contend that there would have been the same falling-off if the examination had been held simultaneously in India?

In view of the difficulties that still confront the Bombay Government it is obvious that the choice of a new Governor is even more serious than usual. To fill the post with some discarded politician who had been a failure in home politics, or with some untried man of title, who would have to serve his political apprenticeship at the expense of the Province, would be nothing short of an outrage. It is, therefore, with considerable sympathy that we hail the suggestion of the *Pioneer* that Sir Antony MacDonnell should be the next Governor of Bombay. In his present position he has shown not only tact and ability but also sympathy, and as a result his rule has been an unqualified success. Our contemporary is doubtful whether he would accept the Governorship of Bombay immediately after the close of his arduous labours as Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces. But few will be found to deny that the offer ought to be made to him.

The meeting at Belgaum to discuss inoculation, to which we referred some weeks ago, cropped up in an unexpected way at the last meeting of the Bombay Legislative Council when Lord Sandhurst took Mr. Chhatre to task for the speech he had then made. The report on which the Governor grounded his remarks happened to be inaccurate. But it appears to have been entirely without precedent to call a member of the Council to account for words spoken outside the Council at a public meeting. One of the points taken by Mr. Chhatre at Belgaum has since received a curious illustration. He complained that inoculation was enforced against Indians while Europeans in the same position remained without inoculation, and that, too, though the European community professed such great faith therein. Sir Reginald Hart, if the reports do not belie him, answered that the English were not in danger of taking the infection. But we now hear that not only have three English children been seized in the barracks at Belgaum, but, worse still, that Miss Murphy, a European nurse in the Civil Hospital, has died of the plague, thus ending her labours of mercy by the sacrifice of her life. It is right to add that Sir Reginald Hart seems to have shown himself more sympathetic in deed than in speech, and that, in spite of the differences of opinion that appeared at the public meeting, all classes have been working together with considerable success in the fight against the plague.

According to the *Mahratta* the Bombay Government assumed that plague administration, if entrusted to Native agency, would be a failure. But this was not the experience in such Native States as were attacked. In none of these States was the plague so widely spread or so fatal as in Poona, in none did it cause so great an expenditure, and in none did it give rise to such conflicts "between the sentiments of the people and the methods of the administration." In Mysore the entire control rested with a Mahratta Brahmin, Mr. V. P. Madhavrao, who gained the confidence not only of his own but also of the Mahometan community, and on whom the Viceroy conferred the Order of the Indian Empire. He had indeed at first to encounter some opposition and even in one place an organised rising. But this was suppressed in a single day, and there was none of the permanent distrust seen in British territory. Of course in medical and scientific matters he followed what had been done elsewhere. But his methods of dealing with the people were his own. "He was therefore in a position to show to advantage the results of a combination of science with sympathy." Especially was this shown in the evacuation of infected areas, the State in this case making far better provision for those compelled to leave their homes than the British Government in India has ever done. We agree with our contemporary in thinking that this is a record of which Indians may well be proud.

The *Bengalee*, the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, and the *Hindu Patriot* all approve of the resignation of the twenty-eight municipal commissioners of Calcutta. Even the *Friend of India*, an Anglo-Indian paper which has urged the necessity of changing the municipal constitution though unable to accept the drastic proposals of the Government, says:—

> As men who value their self-respect they decline to enjoy the sub-

stance of responsibility without the shadow of power; and though they have been careful, by the mouth of more than one spokesman, to disclaim any motive of personal grievance, they must have felt, and felt justly, that years of faithful public service demanded a better return than the Palmer's Bridge speech. On many grounds we regret their resignation, though it is hard to suggest an alternative course of conduct more appropriate to the situation in which the obduracy of the Government has placed the Corporation and equally hard to refuse sympathy to their stand for the principles of local self-government.

Of the fifty elected commissioners it should be remembered that not only have twenty-eight, a clear majority, resigned, but of the remaining twenty-two, eight are Europeans; therefore of the elected Indian members as many as two-thirds have left the Corporation. The *Hindu Patriot* reminds its readers that Sir A. Mackenzie declared that he would throw the Bill into the fire if he had reason to apprehend that in consequence of it men like Babu Kally Nath Mitter and Nalin Behary Sircar would sever their connexion with the Corporation. Now both are gone.

The *Champion* a short time ago spoke of the volunteer force in India as "a costly failure." It therefore welcomes the article which Lieutenant E. Dawson, of the Upper Burma Volunteer Rifles, contributes to the *Journal of the United Service Institution of India.* According to Mr. Dawson "the efficiency and therefore the value of the Indian Volunteer Force at the present time does not amount to a fair return for the expenditure of Government upon it." This could hardly be otherwise. The force consists of some 30,000 men scattered over the whole peninsula. It costs more than twenty lakhs a year. That the Anglo-Indians, birds of passage as they are, for the most part stand aloof is only to be expected, though they are the people who cry out for its retention. That the force is chiefly composed of Eurasians is no bar in itself to its efficiency. But as a matter of fact many of these are volunteers only in name. Minor officials of the State and the railways find it impossible to avoid becoming "volunteers," so strong is the pressure. A force thus raised by compulsion and chiefly from one peculiarly situated class of the community is not likely to show much enthusiasm or to take kindly to discipline and hard work. Mr. Dawson thinks that the pretence of volunteering should be given up and a Militia substituted. But the *Champion* points out that this would probably mean a still greater cost. It is doubtful whether a force so recruited could in any case be of much use in times of trouble, for in such times its members could be least spared from their civil posts.

The *Pioneer*, discussing the transfer of the Imperial Institute to the London University, gives but poor comfort to the Indian subscribers:—

We may recognise that it is a more dignified exit for the Imperial white elephant than if it had degenerated into a second-class music establishment and restaurant.

But what a fall is here—the great embodiment of the Imperial idea become the "Imperial white elephant," only saved from a worse fate by an early death! The *Pioneer* goes on to point the moral by complaining of the pressure, or at least strong influence, brought to bear on the Indian Princes to force them to subscribe. "Never was the social power of royalty more unfortunately exercised." However, it hopes that the failure may serve as an example and a warning "against the future exploitation of the pockets of the Native rulers for objects in which they have no concern and no voice." The *Champion* complains that the Imperial Institute is not the only scheme financed by the aid of the "social power" if not of royalty at least of Viceroys, as was actually done in the case of Lady Dufferin's Fund, and attempted in that of the proposed Pasteur Institute. The *Champion* thinks the *Pioneer* would have done better service if it had indulged in the same plain speaking when these two projects were started.

It is very gratifying to be able to record the election of Mr. Eardley Norton to represent the Madras municipality on the local Legislative Council. Mr. Norton's abilities and capacity for work are well known, and he has manfully maintained his hereditary adherence to the cause of the Indians. The honour, which Mr. Norton will fully appreciate, speaks well for the discernment and gratitude of his fellow-citizens.

Lord Curzon's new departure as to the consideration of projected lines of railway has been sanctioned by resolution of the Government of India. The peripatetic commission is to be a temporary body, assembled as circumstances dictate. It will sit with open doors, and all interested parties will be at liberty to appear in person or by counsel or other duly authorised representative. The members will be the Public Works member of the Viceroy's Council, the Secretary to the Government of India in the Public Works Department (Railways), and an unofficial member of the commercial community approved by the local government of the province in which the commission sits. We do not know whether "approved" means "nominated," or, if not, how this unofficial member is to be selected. At any rate it is to be hoped that the selection will be made in accordance with local feeling, and not in such a way as to constitute the apparently popular and independent member a mere additional voice of the official set. This concession to public opinion must be jealously watched and maintained. Otherwise no good, and not a little evil, will come of it.

The Presidency Banks Act Amendment Bill is meant to be a purely formal affair, with the object of enabling the Presidency Bank of Bombay to deal in securities of the loan already issued by the Bombay City Improvement Trust—a trust that was not even in existence when the Act was last re-enacted. In the course of discussion on the Bill in the Viceroy's Legislative Council Mr. Dawkins dealt to some extent with certain applications for further expansion of the measure. The Bank of Bengal wanted the Council to reconsider the refusal of Lord Elgin's Government to add the securities of the assisted branch lines to securities of railways guaranteed by Government in which alone Presidency banks may deal. The Madras Chamber of Commerce too wanted the Council to introduce further legislation to empower Presidency banks to deal in securities issued by district boards with the authority of Government; and the Chamber was backed by the Presidency Bank of Madras and by the Madras Government. Mr. Dawkins, however, announced that both proposals must stand over, for the Council "could not tack on in a hurry legislation involving questions of principle to a purely formal amendment." He entered into a historical survey to inculcate the need of caution, but concluded with a general indication that "some relaxation is desirable," and the assurance that "the Government is prepared, and has decided, to examine the whole question in no narrow spirit."

Lord Curzon himself confirmed Mr. Dawkins's statement and professed that he would be "grateful for the enlightenment and backing of public opinion" on a question of such importance. This is very nice, no doubt; but we have yet to see how grateful he will prove himself for "the enlightenment of public opinion" when it happens to back somebody else—as in the case of the Calcutta Municipality Bill. Still, it is something to have even a verbal deference to "public opinion." However, Lord Curzon went on to indicate grounds for the contemplated relaxation of restrictions. First, "in the interests of the Banks, so as to increase the scope of their operations"; secondly, and still more, "in the interest of the investing public, and of the general development of the country—which we all have so much at heart."

What we want to do is to enlarge the opportunities available for the employment, in enterprises indigenous and beneficial to the country, of capital, both English and Native. It will be for the latter to profit by the occasion. The Government cannot do more than open the door. It will then be for the investing public to walk in.

We should be very glad indeed to see a worthy development of the country, "which we all have so much at heart," but it is difficult to discern substantial grounds of confidence in any of the Government's enterprises in finance. The Native will probably, with his usual courtesy, allow the British investor to walk in first. Very much will depend upon the conduct of the roving commission. The projected concessions are no doubt useful in smoothing the way for the grand new Bank; but if Indian affairs were managed in a liberal spirit, there would be no opportunity for the remark that Indian banking is "behind the times."

INDIA'S CONCERN IN THE PRESENT CRISIS.

A WORLD-WIDE Empire which links the ancient civilisation of India with such modern democratic communities as Canada and Australia must give rise to many diversities of interest and sympathy, and events, seemingly local and occasional, may well affect all the parts and have a serious bearing on the destiny of each. At first sight it might be thought that the wrongs of the voteless Uitlanders in the Transvaal were no concern of the submissive subjects of the Indian Viceroy, and that an alleged menace to the supremacy of the British race in Southern Africa need hardly trouble those who are oppressed by Englishman and Boer alike. The Indian peasant paying his 500, or it may be his 4,000, per cent. salt tax has never heard the cry of "no taxation without representation," and the Indian trader harried and oppressed alike in Natal, in the Transvaal and in Rhodesia may well care little which flag is there triumphant. Yet from its position as a part of the British Empire the happiness of India is deeply involved. That it is materially involved goes without saying. If war comes the blood of British Indian troops will flow on the field of battle—sacrificed in order that Indians may be oppressed and insulted by the Legislature and people of Natal rather than by the authorities of the South African Republic. It is indeed a striking comment on our care for the interests of India that that poverty-stricken country should be able to spare soldiers for Africa. If India has no greater army than is necessary for her safety, how can she part with troops for service abroad? If she has a greater army than is necessary for her own purposes, is she forced in her poverty to keep up troops for the general purposes of the Empire? If the Russian bogey which has been so often invoked to justify military expenditure has any basis of reality, when would it be more dangerous than at a time when England was engaged in war in another part of the world? Yet this is the very time when India is denuded of a part of her defenders. Either the Indian army is too large or the safety of the country is imperilled for the sake of Imperial schemes in Africa.

But it is not only materially that India is interested in the present African crisis. There is much in the events that have led up to the present situation that reflects light on the present and the future of our Eastern dependency. The Indian cannot help comparing the grievances of the Uitlanders with those of his own countrymen both at home and abroad; he cannot help contrasting the eagerness for the redress of the former with the apathy and indifference shown in regard to the latter. Nay, he will see not without wonder that amid all the talk of redressing the one there is an inclination to increase the other; and that those who are loudest in demanding liberty for Johannesburg view with the utmost calm the invasion of the liberties of Calcutta. Beyond this painful comparison, there is still another point of view from which the African crisis is full of menace to India. That country has long believed in the justice and generosity of the English people. She has looked to it as to the final Court of Appeal where sooner or later the worst of wrongs are sure of redress and the worst of sufferings are certain to be assuaged. The ultimate dependence of India has been on the character of the English. If then she finds the English sense of justice blunted, if she finds the bully and the braggart becoming the idols of the nation, and the greed of Empire or of gain the moving forces of the nation's will, India may well tremble for her own future, and bestir herself to gain some resolution from despair.

It is the fashion now to compare the freedom of English rule with the tyranny of Mr. Kruger and his Ministers, the ease with which full citizenship can be obtained in our own colonies and the obstacles to its attainment in the Transvaal. And if there be a part of our Empire in South Africa which is specially held up to our admiration, it is not the Cape Colony with its Africander majority, but the essentially British and Imperialist colony of Natal. Yet what boots it to Indians that the German or the Pole can easily obtain citizenship in Natal, when they who are already citizens of the Empire there find themselves Uitlanders, threatened in their livelihood if they be traders, stinted in the education of their children, hustled and insulted when they come to show their loyalty and veneration for the Empress-Queen. The Indian and the colonist may be citizens of the same Empire and subjects of the same monarch, but the former must not hope for equal treatment with the latter. The cry of the Transvaal Uitlander is sure of a hearing, nay will be re-echoed and magnified by hundreds of newspapers throughout the Empire. But the cry of the Natal Uitlander, of the Indian who is already our fellow-citizen in our glorious Empire—who will re-echo that? Far be it from English Statesmen, however much they may threaten elsewhere, to interfere with the freedom of the Natal Government to oppress our Indian fellow-citizens. Far be it from Imperialist journalists to expose the wrongs that happen within the Empire. We keep our threats and our denunciations for those beyond our borders, for those whose independence is an eyesore to us and whose wealth we covet, and we leave the wrongs of our own household unmourned and unredressed.

If we consider the Uitlanders' grievances, not in comparison with those which the Indians suffer in Natal but with those they suffer in their own country, the same truth will appear—the readiness with which we cast out the mote from our neighbour's eye while we leave the beam in our own. For what are the chief grievances of the Uitlanders—that they have to wait many years before they can obtain the franchise or become members of the Transvaal Parliament, that English is not allowed in the proceedings of that body, that judges are removable by the Executive, that the Police are corrupt, and that the money raised from the Uitlanders by taxation is spent for purposes that they dislike or from which they obtain no benefit. The first of these has by itself almost been the cause of war. Ministers have haggled as to whether aliens should be naturalised and have the vote after seven years' residence as Mr. Kruger proposed, and as is practically the qualification in England, or whether as Sir Alfred Milner insisted, five years, should be sufficient. It is a terrible wrong that any German or Russian who has swaggered into the Transvaal with his British citizenship newly created in one of our colonies should have to wait more than five years before he can take part in an election to the Transvaal Parliament. How many years has an Indian to wait before he can take part in the government of his country? The alien in the Transvaal is one of a floating population, the great majority of which thinks only of making sufficient money to retire to Europe with. They have no abiding place in the land. To the English among them, England is still "home." The Indian, on the other hand, is in his own native land, in the land where his fathers lived before him, and his children will after him, in the land with which all his hopes, all his thoughts, and all the tenderest feelings of his heart are inextricably bound up. And it is there that he finds himself treated as an alien. Yet amid all the loud voices that proclaim the wrongs of the Uitlander, what voice is raised for the greater wrongs of the Indian?

It is the same with the other grievances. The Uitlanders complain that Dutch is the official language of the Transvaal. Is not English the official language of India? Are not those Indians who aspire to compete for places in the Civil Service of their country compelled not only to pass their examination in an alien tongue but in a distant land, thousands of miles from home? Are not the judges in the inferior courts in India not only removable by the Executive but themselves executive officers, so that the very distinction is lost? Are not the Indian police notoriously corrupt even on the admission of the most strenuous supporters of the present system? And is not the money of the Indian taxpayer not only spent in keeping up a most expensive system of government but squandered against his will in wars beyond the frontier? Wherein then is the position of the Uitlander worse than that of the Indian?

But besides the different reception given to the claims of Uitlander and Indian, there are other aspects of the Transvaal question, which must strike the Indians as ominous. They have been wont to rely on the English as a people in the main anxious to do justice, and ready to make sacrifices for that end. They have been proud of the great Empire of which they formed a part. But throughout the negotiations that have recently taken place between the British Government and the Transvaal, and still more in the comments of the Imperialist Press in England, they must have seen with misgiving that very different qualities from a love of justice were displayed. The Indians cannot have failed to note the hypocrisy with

which the wrongs of the Uitlanders have been made the cloak of a policy of aggression and interference, and the bad faith with which the Convention was appealed to when it was a question of suzeraินty and ignored when it was a question of intervention in the internal affairs of the Republic. They must have seen the evident desire to attain ends by bullying rather than by persuasion, and to make a national triumph out of the righting of supposed wrongs. But they can hardly have been prepared to see the abject surrender to our wishes of a small and weak nation treated as necessary to the maintenance of our Imperial prestige. Nor can they have seen without dismay the part that material interests have played in the controversy or the fell influence of the African millionaires. Above all, the Indians must have despaired when they saw the forces of the Empire, India included, marshalled to protect not so much its people nor its territory but the "supremacy of the English race." For if that is to be the end and aim of the British Empire, the outlook for India is dark indeed.

MR. MAX MÜLLER'S REMINISCENCES.[1]

WHILE Professor Max Müller writes about his "Indian Friends," he really contrives to work in a good deal of autobiographical materials. Thus, it was as far back as 1833, when he was a small boy at school at Dessau in the Duchy of Anhalt—where a statue has long stood in worthy memory of his distinguished father—that he was first attracted to India by a large picture of Benares on the outside of his copybook. It was in 1841 at the University of Leipzig that he heard of the foundation of a Chair of Sanskrit, and saw lectures on Indian literature advertised by Professor Brockhaus. Initiated by Brockhaus during several semesters, he next proceeded to Berlin to study under Bopp, and thereafter he was attracted to Paris by the fame of Burnouf. In Paris he worked hard at the beginning of Rig-Veda, and he continued his labours on Sâya*n*a's commentary in London.

Such vague and extravagant accounts (he says) have been spread and even published as to the magnificent *honorariums* paid to me by the late East India Company that I may as well state that, even if I could have carried through the press one sheet per week, after copying, collating, and adding all the references to Sâya*n*a's commentary, I should never have earned more than £200 a year for a work which during more than twenty years of my life occupied nearly all my time. . . . . If people will invent and exaggerate, I may as well tell them that I believe the youngest clerk in the India Office would have declined to work for twenty years at such a salary as I did. And yet I was as happy as a king all the time.

Of course he could not possibly pass the sheets for press with such expedition as he assumes in the calculation; and the indirect statement will furnish a glimpse of the unselfish devotion of the scholar. His obscure and ill-rewarded labour must, no doubt, have been lightened by the recognition of competent scholars, and the gratitude of clear-sighted Indians. The great edition of the Rig-Veda not only "helped to usher in quite a new period in Sanskrit scholarship in Europe," but it "naturally produced an even greater commotion all over India." It was the Brahman Bible, and it "had never been published before during the three or four thousand years of its existence." There are further glimpses of Professor Max Müller at Oxford, where many Indians visited him.

Some of his "Indian Friends" the author knows personally, others he knew by correspondence or only by report, and in the number he includes the Indian books and personages of his study, notably the Veda.

For, after all (he says), was not the Veda the first of my Indian friends? Was it not the bridge that led me from West to East, from Greece and Italy to India, nay, from Dessau to Oxford, from Germany to England? Whatever other people may say about the misguided man who sacrificed everything to the Veda, I still count the Veda among my best friends, and I sometimes regret that my duties as Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Oxford should, during my later years, have withdrawn my full allegiance to it.

Unfortunately Professor Max Müller has never visited India, though one time he thought of going out as a missionary to satisfy his desire to know the people and their literature. He has met a good few Indians, who, he has been assured, are for the most part exceptional and not representative; but still he maintains stoutly that they at least indicate what Indians are capable of becoming. He has "had but visions of the rivers, the mountains, the valleys, the forests, and the men and women of India;" but he has "known for many years the beauties of its literature, the bold flights of its native philosophy, the fervid devotion of its ancient religion," and from these he thinks he has derived "a much truer picture of what India really was, and is still meant to be, in the history of the world," than he could have gathered from "the Bazaars of Bombay, or the Durbars of Râjas and Mahârâjas at Delhi." The picture, at all events, is a noble one, inspiring and hopeful. If there be error in it, it is error on the generous side. Professor Max Müller does not hesitate to indicate that we have fallen short of "a full appreciation of the intellectual achievements of ancient and mediæval India"—mainly, he thinks, because "they are mostly looked upon, as we look on the prodigies in our exhibitions, as simply curious." Why is this?

It cannot surely be the brown skin that keeps us from feeling the same sympathy and paying the same homage to the poets and philosophers of India [as to Plato and Aristotle], and that even prevents at the present day any real friendship between the best sons of India and England. That brown skin may at first cause a feeling of strangeness, but I know how easily that feeling can be and has been overcome; and judging from my own limited experience I can truly say that there is behind that warm and almost Italian colour of the Aryas of India the same warm heart, the same trust, and the same love as under the white skin of Europeans. Real friendship between the rulers and the ruled in India ought to be no impossibility; it has existed again and again; only it should no longer be the exception, but the rule.

We trust this declaration of an eminent scholar will be laid to heart.

The first Indian friend commemorated by Professor Max Müller is Dvârkanâth Tagore, whom he met at Paris with Professor Burnouf. Dvârkanâth was fond of music, and in connexion with Indian music, which Professor Max Müller did not appreciate, he made a very pregnant remark:—

You are all alike; if anything seems strange to you and does not please you at once you turn away. When I first heard Italian music it was no music to me at all; but I went on and on till I began to like it, or what you call understand it. It is the same with everything else. You say our religion is no religion, our poetry no poetry, our philosophy no philosophy. We try to understand and appreciate what Europe has produced, but do not imagine that therefore we despise what India has produced. If you studied our music as we do yours you would find that there is melody, rhythm, and harmony in it, quite as much as in yours. And if you would study our poetry, our religion, and our philosophy, you would find that we are not what you call heathens or miscreants, but know as much of the Unknowable as you do, and have seen perhaps even deeper into it than you have.

Professor Max Müller says "he was not far wrong;" and indeed the vistas opened up run deep in many directions. We are so impatient of Indian views that our criticisms are insufficiently provided with the indispensable basis of knowledge to make them reasonably true. Then comes Debendranâth Tagore, Dvârkanâth's son, a very striking figure also. Quoting a letter written by him, Professor Max Müller says:—

Such a letter seems to me a most instructive and characteristic page in the recent history of India. Let us think, first of all, whether there is a single man living in Europe, a man of wealth and high position in his country, who could have penned such a letter in a foreign language whether German or Sanskrit. There is hardly a word in it that would have to be altered, and as to the spirit pervading it, no bishop need be ashamed of it. And yet how many people are there even among members of the Indian Civil Service, who would look upon this man as their equal, not to say as their better?

Next is the Râja Râdhâkânta Deva, "a kind of Indian Lord Shaftesbury," who had "distinguished himself by publishing a large thesaurus of the Sanskrit language in seven large quarto volumes." He was among the first to recognise Professor Max Müller's edition of the Rig-Veda, a recognition all the more important as he stood at the head of the strictly orthodox and conservative party in Bengal. And a noble recognition it was. "If," says Professor Max Müller, "we wish to understand and to appreciate the effort made by this highly educated Indian nobleman to digest what must have been a hard morsel to his orthodox mind, the edition of his own sacred book by a German or an Englishman, let us try to imagine what it would have been to us if the New Testament, never printed before, had been published for the first time, not by a Dutch scholar, such as Erasmus, but by a Hindu at Benares." But it is just in this point of imagination that the English mind is deficient.

Professor Max Müller now passes from scholars to religionists. A very striking episode is the interview be-

[1] "Auld Lang Syne." Second Series. "My Indian Friends." By the Right Hon. F. Max Müller. London and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co.

'tween Nilakantha (Nehemiah) Goreh and the Professor at Oxford. Nehemiah (so he called himself when he became a Christian) had converted himself by independent study, and his patron, Dhulip Singh, had placed him in a missionary seminary in London. How was he treated by his fellow students?

They showed him no sympathy and love, but found fault with everything he did and said. He had been, as I soon found out, a careful student of Hindu philosophy, and his mind had passed through a strict philosophical discipline. . . . . The fact was he stood too high for his companions, and they were evidently unable to understand and appreciate his thoughts. . . . . And yet this man was treated as a kind of nigger by those who ought to have been not only kind but respectful to him.

And what of this "Christian country"? Said Goreh: "If what I have seen in London is Christianity, I want to go back to India; if that is Christianity, I am not a Christian." What a commentary, and that too by "a kind of nigger"! Then comes Keshub Chunder Sen, and Professor Max Müller sketches the more important of his reforming predecessors—Chaitanya (1485-1527) and Nânak and his principal disciples. We have already seen his view of Keshub Chunder Sen elsewhere. Next is Râmtonoo Lahari (born 1813), a pupil of David Hare, attracted to the new Brâhma-Samâj and Keshub. Then Dayânanda Sarasvatî, who inaugurated the Arya-Samâj, and whose career has been distorted by "the so-called Theosophists," whom Professor Max Müller rightly handles without tenderness. Finally, Râmakrishna, to whom the author recently devoted a special volume. More than once he points out that the utilisation of the existing "strong and healthy fermentation" in the religious life of India calls for personal guidance. "People are ready to be led, but they expect a leader to lead them."

It is unnecessary to cite further examples. Professor Max Müller deals with Behramji Malabâri, Râmabâi and her friend Dr. Ânandibâi Joshee, Gaurîshankar Udayshankar Ozá (Minister of Bhavnagar), and Srîmatî (a child-wife) and her husband Kedar Nâth. Each of his friends and correspondents leads him to diverge upon interesting views of the various forms of Indian life and thought suggested by their characteristics and careers; and he gives a special section to the Veda. Most, if not all, of this we have come across before, yet it is freshly put and charmingly illustrated; and the spirit of it all is admirable. If a single sentence could sum up the substance of it, take this one: "What I feel, and what I wish my friends would feel with me, is that a country which, even in these unheroic days, could produce a Rammohun Roy, a Keshub Chunder Sen, a Malabâri, and a Râmabâi, is not a decadent country, but may look forward to a bright sunny future, as it can look back with satisfaction and even pride on four thousand years of a not inglorious history." True; and there are many aspects, omitted by the author, to which the like language is equally applicable.

THE PEOPLE OF INDIA:
THEIR MANY MERITS BY MANY WHO HAVE KNOWN THEM.

Collected and Edited with an Introduction by ALFRED WEBB, *(President Tenth Indian National Congress).*

III.

CONSTANCE F. GORDON CUMMING. *Author of Works on India and the East*, 1886, *etc.*

'I greatly marvelled at the contemptuous indifference displayed by the great mass of Europeans to all matters relating to the faith (and practice) of the brown multitudes around them, as to a tissue of puerile fables unworthy of the smallest attention. Yet, considering that we are here in the cradle of two of the most widely spread faiths of the world (Brahminism and Buddhism); and that the fundamental truths of both had been thought out by men of this self-same race many centuries ere light from the East first dawned on. Pagan Britain, it seems strange indeed that any can live in India, and yet give no heed to the present development of the said creeds, and their application to the daily lives of about 700,000,000 of our fellow men in Asia.' . . . . 'Hindus, whose marvellous self-denial in the service of their gods does certainly put our self-indulgent practice of Christianity to the blush. No one who studies the creed and practice of this race with unbiassed mind, can fail to be struck with their intense earnestness in living up to teaching which, however distorted, has in it rich veins of thought—perverted forms of the very doctrines which we deem most sacred.' . . . . 'So too, although we Christians are taught that, "whether we eat or drink or whatsoever we do, we should do all to the glory of God." I think it can scarcely be a transgression of charity to judge that comparatively few habitually obey this precept, whereas the most casual observer cannot fail to see that in the daily life of the average Hindu, this is the ruling principle.' . . . . 'At present the prominent aspect of Christianity to the Native mind is that of a faith which allows its votaries to eat unclean meat at all times, and do their own will in all things.' . . . . 'As attendants they' [Hindus] 'are wonderfully good. Quick, noiseless, detecting in a moment what is wanted, patient and "answering not again" to an extent that might sometimes shame their masters, who certainly have no more claim to faultlessness than "the niggers" of whom they think so lightly; for to see an Englishman fly into a passion with a Native, and strike a man who dares not hit him back, is humiliating indeed. If not cowardly, it certainly is horribly derogatory to British dignity, and quite the most painful sight you are likely to witness.'—'*In the Himalayas and on the Indian Plains*,' *C. F. Gordon Cumming, Chatto and Windus*, 1886.

WILLIAM DIGBY, C.I.E. *Political Agent in Indian Service; Secretary Famine Relief Fund*, 1876-78.

'I only stay to add my stone of testimony to the cairn Max Müller raises to the truthful character and commercial honour of the Indian people generally, and of the merchants in particular. Even in regard to philanthropy England cannot put India to shame.' . . . . 'What the Indian races were in the times of Akbar they are now. Their capacity is not lessened, their brain power is as great, their skill in administration has not failed; this they show day by day, year in, year out; all that they need is a fair field and liberty for the free play of their faculties, and that their merits, even when recorded, should not be suppressed whether accidently or deliberately. If we have constructed railways and made roads, the Indians of days gone by dug canals and built irrigation works of a magnitude and of a solidity which are alike a marvel to us of to-day and a defiance almost of decay. These were "imperial works and worthy of kings." There is nothing we have done in India which that country's sons could not do as well, or better, with perhaps one exception, and that a very important one, the magnitude of which the writer will not attempt to minimise.' . . . . 'That is, except when *we* elect to fight there is peace in the land.' . . . . 'This done, we ought to have stayed our hand. More than this, and all it involves, we ought not to have attempted.—'*India for the Indians and for England*,' *William Digby, C.I.E., Talbot Brothers*, 1885.

'There are not more law-abiding, contented, and on the whole lovable races under the wide sway of the Queen than the people of India. These good qualities, however, are not developed from the comfort of their surroundings, but exist in spite of misery which might be expected to render goodness impossible.' . . . . 'The patience of the men and women with whom we have to do is wonderful. During ordinary periods there is far less crime among them than among people similarly situated in any European country. But it is in times of sore distress, when food is five times above its normal price, and not easy to get then, that their patience is truly sublime. Take their conduct during the awful times of 1876 and 1877. They saw their crops perish before their eyes, and did not consider that they must wreak vengeance upon their rulers, or in any way disturb the public peace; they were starving, but not one in a hundred thousand resorted to robbery.' . . . . 'The district judge at Trichinopoly (Mr. E. Foster Webster) speaking of people whose sense of self-respect would not allow them to attend a Government relief camp, said, "The closer you look into matters and the better you know the people, the more you see how fearfully widely-spread is the present distress, borne by the poor creatures in dumb resignation to fate, and with scarcely a murmur."' . . . . 'Again, as to their kindliness towards one another. The famine gave wonderful proof of the depth and sincerity of this quality. We saw it in our own homes, in the privations our servants endured that they might be able to help their friends who had no work; we met with numerous instances in our offices, where the employées visibly grew thinner and more woe-begone day by day, the higher wages given by employers going to support relatives in greater need than those by whom increased pay was received. One Native member of the Central Famine Committee said to me one day, "I have thirty-five people depending upon me for daily food." It was a common experience in our Relief Camps and in our Day Nurseries to note that the people did not struggle with one another as to who should be first served; it seemed as if the rule was, the greater the need of the individual the greater the goodness and the patience displayed. "Mothers, aunts, grandmothers, or neighbours," said one diligent worker in the cause of relief, who had medical oversight of a day nursery, "will bring children to be fed, and, though in want themselves, never express, by word or sign, a desire to share in the help they know is meant only for young children. Big boys will bring little boys, and, though lank and hungry, and casting longing eyes on food, are only intent on seeing that their charges get their allotted ration. For six weeks past a little girl of ten or eleven has

been bringing up two sickly children twice a day, nursing them with the tenderest care, and never asking bite or sup on her own account."' . . . . 'As regards personal conduct, general abstinence, and the like, the Indian people of the lower classes are, if not all that could be desired, at least far better than those in other countries.' . . . . 'As for the higher classes, what is their character, what their disposition? Are they worthy of fellowship with Englishmen? Are they deserving of a little self-sacrificing effort on our part, that ample space and verge enough shall be provided in which they may grow to a proper mental, moral, and political standard? The reader shall judge?' [Mr. Digby here quotes Sir Richard Temple as given under his name.] 'In business life, to take another class in the social scale, the average Indian is as much worthy of consideration, esteem and trust as is the agriculturist.' . . . . 'We come to the professional men. These, as scholastic professors, barristers, lawyers, and Government servants, are in no degree behind their countrymen in other ranks of life in exhibiting aspects of character of a praiseworthy kind.' . . . . 'There now remains one other class of Indians whom I wish specially to mention. A knowledge of them, and an acquaintance with their work, cannot fail to deepen the respect which the English people should cherish for their fellow-subjects in India. I refer to the tradesmen who, in peculiar positions and with many restraints, have given evidence of the possession of wonderful faculties and marvellous ability.'—*'Indian Problems for English Consideration,' William Digby, C.I.E.*, 1881.

ABBE J. A. DUBOIS. *Missionary in India for thirty years (writing in* 1820).

'I will candidly confess to you that the highly exaggerated accounts of the Rev. —— and the severity with which he treats these poor Hindus are far from being a subject of edification to me. I have, at different times, perused many of the public accounts of the new reformers of several sects, settled of late in several parts of India, communicated to their correspondents in England, and I cannot disguise to you that their exaggerations and misrepresentations (not to use harsher terms) respecting the Hindus have been to me a subject of much scandal, and have, in several instances, roused my indignation to a high degree. In fact, from their reports, I see that those gentlemen particularly delight in representing these people under the blackest and most odious colours. With them the Hindus are nothing but barbarians: a people loaded with every kind of vice, without a single spark of virtue. Not only their religion, but also their system of civilization, their character, their public and domestic institutions—all their usages and practices—are indiscriminately branded with infamy and held forth to public contempt, and they themselves are abused, reviled, and degraded almost to the level of brutes. Such is, as far as I can judge from their public reports, the view taken of these people by most of the new reformers at present settled among them. But I am happy to know that a quite different view of the subject has been taken by a Warren Hastings, a Burke, a Cornwallis, a Robertson, a Sir William Jones, a Colebrooke, a Hawkins, a Wilkins, and many other enlightened persons who had made close and deep researches on all that relates to the Hindus, had candour enough to acknowledge also their virtues, and to make a just estimate of what was good and what was bad in their institutions. Now it is a subject of regret to see that the opinions and authority of so many enlightened and independent persons are disregarded, to listen to the suspicious accounts and wild theories of men of mediocrity, who have of late undertaken the altogether impracticable task of reforming these nations in their religion, morals, and manners. I am also happy that, in my humble sphere and obscure station, an experience of thirty years passed in an unrestrained intercourse with these people has taught me a quite different theory, and to view the subject in a much more favourable light. I am happy at the end of my researches to find that, in witnessing among them many disgusting vices, I have been able to discover also many eminent virtues. It is true that some of my critics have accused me of being tinctured with Hinduism, and strongly biassed in favour of the Hindus, because in describing their vices and bad qualities I had also presumed to take notice of their virtues and good qualities; but the fact is, that if I have anything to reproach myself with in my writings on the subject of the Hindus it is to have been rather too severe in finding faults with them in matters which would perhaps have been a subject of praise to more unbiassed authors. On the other hand, the Hindus are not in want of improvement in the discharge of social duties among themselves. They understand this point as well as, and perhaps better than, Europeans. They might even be said to be rather excessive in this respect in several instances. They will never suffer the needy who has implored their charity to go unassisted. Their hospitality among themselves, it is well known, has no bounds. Even the humble, the distressed pariah, as long as he has a measure of grain in his possession, will cheerfully share his pap of millet with the weary traveller of his caste who may happen to take shelter in his hut; and in all their wants and distresses the Hindus of all castes will readily assist each other more effectually than the European would do in the same circumstances. What the European possesses he keeps for himself. What the Hindu possesses he is always disposed to share with those who have nothing. In fact, it might be said that a wealthy Hindu considers himself as the depository or the distributor rather than the proprietor of his fortune, so greatly prone is he to acts of charity and benevolence; and it is chiefly from this cause that those frequent revolutions in the fortunes of the Hindus and those frequent passages from extreme opulence to extreme poverty arise.' . . . . 'It will perhaps be found that, among an equal number of distressed people, the proportion of determined rogues is greater in Europe than in India.'—*Supplied in MS. by Mr. Talcher Kar, from a letter of Abbe Dubois from Seringapatam, December* 15, 1820.

SIR CHARLES A. ELLIOTT, K.C.S.I., C.S.I. *Served in India,* 1857 *to* 1895; *Lieutenant-Governor Bengal,* 1890-95.

'The natives of India are often said to be altogether ignorant of truth. I have not found them so. In court, no doubt, far from the public opinion of their own village, bribed or interested witnesses are guilty of amazing flights of perjury. But in their own villages among their own people, I have seldom known them to tell a lie, even when the truth was to their own prejudice.' . . . . 'About thirty-five years ago I was "in camp" in an Oudh district, leading the kind of life I have described, and was out shooting with a Rájá of those parts as my companion. We lost our way, and wandered on for some while, rather puzzled, when we came to an opening in the jungle, and my friend said, "Now, I know where we are; that's the village where the man lives whom you put out of caste." "What do you mean by that?" cried I. "Oh, don't you remember what happened at Singirampur when Allahabad's case came before you?" Then the story came back to me. About a month before I had been trying a case, arising out of a family quarrel, in the village he mentioned, sitting under a tree and surrounded by all the villagers; and the man who was an important witness, persisted in telling a story which I knew to be false. I plied him and cross-questioned him and tried to get the truth out of him in vain. At last I turned to the assemblage and said: "I can make nothing out of him; but you know if he is telling the truth. If, as I believe, he is lying, he has disgraced his village and his caste-fellows. See you to it." I had thought no more of the matter till this day; and now I find that the men of his clan held a meeting, judged him and passed on him that most terrible of all sentences—they put him out of caste. I always like to tell this story when people say to me that the natives of India have no love for truth.'—*'Battersea Polytechnic Journal,' as quoted in 'Amrita Bazar Patrika,' circa. June,* 1899.

'No one can live long in the country without feeling a real regard for its people, and it spoke well for the people of India that the complaints against them came mostly from those who had the least experience, and that those who had been longest in India, and had the completest knowledge of their habits, were those who felt most kindly towards them.'—*'Native Opinion,' Bombay, August* 20, 1899.

MOUNT-STUART ELPHINSTONE. *Served in Government of India* 1795-1829; *Governor of Bombay,* 1819-27; *Refused Governor-Generalship of India.*

'Englishmen in India have less opportunity than might be expected of forming opinions of the Native character. Even in England, few know much of the people beyond their own class, and what they do know they learn from newspapers and publications of a description which does not exist in India. In that country, also, religion and manners put bars to our intimacy with the Natives, and limit the number of transactions as well as the free communication of opinions. We know nothing of the interior of families but by report, and have no share in those numerous occurrences of life in which the amiable parts of character are most exhibited. Missionaries of a different religion, judges, police magistrates, officers of revenue or customs, and even diplomatists, do not see the most virtuous portion of a nation, nor any portion, unless when influenced by passion, or occupied by some personal interest. What we do see we judge by our own standards.' . . . . 'It might be argued in opposition to many unfavourable testimonies, that those who have known the Indians the longest have always the best opinion of them; but this is rather a compliment to human nature than to them, since it is true of every other people. It is more in point that all persons retiring from India think better of the people they have left after comparing them with others, even of the most justly admired nations.' . . . . 'Merchants and bankers are generally strict observers of their engagements. If it were otherwise, commerce could not go on where justice is so irregularly administered.' . . . . 'The labouring people are industrious and persevering.' . . . . 'Their contempt of death is, indeed, an extraordinary concomitant to their timidity when exposed to lesser evils. When his fate is inevitable, the lowest Hindu encounters it with a coolness that would excite admiration in Europe, converses with his friends with cheerfulness, and awaits the approach of death without any diminution of his usual serenity.' . . . . 'The villagers are everywhere an inoffensive, amiable people, affectionate to their families, kind to their neighbours, and, towards all but the Government,

honest and sincere.' . . . . 'The townspeople are of a more mixed character; but they are quiet and orderly, seldom disturbing the public peace by tumults, or their own by private broils. On the whole, if we except those connected with the Government, they will bear a fair comparison with the people of towns in England. Their advantages in religion and government give a clear superiority to our middle classes; and even among the labouring class, there are many to whom no parallel could be found in any rank in India; but, on the other hand, there is no set of people among the Hindus so depraved as the dregs of our great towns; and the swarms of persons who live by fraud—sharpers, imposters, and adventurers of all descriptions, from those who mix with the higher orders down to those who prey on the common people—are almost unknown in India. Some of the most conspicuous of the crimes in India exceed those of all other countries in atrocity.' . . . . 'The horror excited by such enormities leads us at first to imagine peculiar depravity in the country where they occur: but a further enquiry removes that impression. Including Thugs and Dacoits, the mass of crime in India is less than in England. Thugs are almost a separate nation, and Dacoits are desperate ruffians who enter into permanent gangs and devote their lives to rapine; but the remaining part of the population is little given to such passions as destroy. Murders are oftener from jealousy, or some such motive, than from gain; and theft is confined to particular classes; so that there is little uneasiness regarding property. Europeans sleep with every door in the house open, and their property scattered about as it lay in the daytime, and seldom have to complain of loss; even with so numerous a body of servants as fills every private house, it is no small proof of habitual confidence, to see scarcely anything locked up.' . . . . 'The natives of India are often accused of wanting gratitude; but it does not appear that those who make the charge have done much to inspire such a sentiment.' . . . . 'Then freedom from gross debauchery is the point in which the Hindus appear to most advantage. It can scarcely be expected, from their climate and its concomitants, that they should be less licentious than other nations; but if we compare them with our own, the absence of drunkenness and of immodesty in their own vices, will leave the superiority in purity of manners on the side least flattering to our self-esteem. Their indifference to the grossest terms in conversation appears inconsistent with this praise; but it has been well explained as arising from "that simplicity which conceives that whatever can exist without blame, may be named without offence;" and this view is confirmed by the decorum of their behaviour in other respects.' . . . . 'The cleanliness of the Hindus in their persons is proverbial.' . . . . 'Hindu children are much more quick and intelligent than European ones. The capacity of lads of twelve and fourteen is often surprising; and not less so is the manner in which their feelings become blunted after the age of puberty. But at all ages they are very intelligent, and this strikes us most in the lower classes, who in propriety of demeanour and command of language, are far less different from their superiors than with us.'—'*History of India,' Hon. Mountstuart Elphinstone, Murray*, 1866.

(To be continued.)

MR. HEM CHANDRA BANERJEA.

LETTER FROM SIR WILLIAM HUNTER.

The following Note appeared in our issue of last week:—

Mr. Hem Chandra Banerjea, we regret to learn, has fallen into "sore distress." He is the greatest living poet of Bengal, and has thrilled his countrymen with his elevated and patriotic muse. Like so many men of genius and of large heart, he has neglected the ways of money-making and now suffers for his lack of worldly prudence. But, as *Lower and Guardian* says in a noble appeal on behalf of the poet, "a Hem Chandra Banerjea is not born every day," and "it would be a shame and a disgrace if the greatest living poet of Bengal should die of starvation." Or, we may add, live in starvation. It is the privilege of men of comfortable means to succour a helpless brother of eminent spiritual merit in his distress. It is a duty that will be regarded as an honour.

We have since received the following letter from Sir William Hunter. The letter, it will be seen, was a private one, but Sir William Hunter has kindly authorised us to print it:—

[PRIVATE.]

To the Editor of "INDIA."

Dear Sir,—I am greatly distressed to read in your issue of this week that the poet Hem Chandra Banerjea is in straitened circumstances, and I feel sure that there are many admirers of his genius who, like myself, would esteem it a privilege to be of any service to him. It is many years since I wrote in "The Indian Empire" that no list of Bengali authors of the nineteenth century would be complete without his name. He is a poet in a high and rare sense, who has stirred the hearts of his countrymen to noble issues, and whose works will have an honoured place in the literature of India.

If you think it suitable to open a subscription for his comfort or relief, I beg you will put me down for one hundred rupees. But should this course not commend itself to your judgment, I shall be obliged if you will let me have his address.—I am, very faithfully yours, W. W. HUNTER.

Oaken Holt, near Oxford,
September 23, 1899.

We need only add that, in accordance with this suggestion, we shall be happy to acknowledge in our columns and to remit to Mr. Hem Chandra Banerjea any subscriptions which our readers may forward. Letters should be addressed to the Editor of INDIA, 84, Palace Chambers, S.W.

THE RANGOON OUTRAGE.

ACQUITTAL OF PRIVATE THORPE.

IMPORTANT RIDER BY THE JURY.

[FROM THE "PIONEER."]

RANGOON, August 30.

At to-day's sitting of the Rangoon Criminal Sessions it was arranged that the jury in the Rangoon outrage case need not attend on Friday, which would be devoted to arguments as to the admissibility of certain statements made by the accused soldiers, first to their regimental officers and secondly to the military court of enquiry. Saturday and Monday will be devoted to the trial of other cases, and the hearing of the charge against Private Thorpe will be resumed on Tuesday.

The following evidence was taken to-day:—

T. A. Abraham, a clerk in the Burma Secretariat, said he was going towards the tram-cars at the Pagoda when he met a number of Burmans running away, apparently scared. They told him a woman had been taken away by soldiers. He went up the hill over the *nullah* and saw two soldiers with the woman, one holding her down while the others were looking on. One soldier had a rusty *dah*. He could not recognise any of the soldiers. Some had coats and some not. Some were in white and some in khaki. No stones were thrown while he was there, but he saw loose bricks on the road. He heard that the police had been sent for, and he went towards the tramway a few hundred yards away. There he saw a soldier whom he identified as Private Sullivan. He saw Horricks being arrested.

Maung Shwe Min, a clerk, deposed to being told by Mah Doung of the occurrence. He and his companions, about fifteen, ran up the slope to the top of the hill and saw a soldier with a *dah*. Three soldiers came out of the *nullah* and threw stones at the witness and his companions. The higher ground was covered with soldiers. Witness and the others ran away. Later on the police arrived and both the police and Burmans were stoned by soldiers. Eventually a corporal arrived, the soldiers dispersed and Private Horricks was arrested. Mah Goon had to be assisted to a gharry.

Further evidence of the same character was given.

Corporal William Nurse, C. Company, West Kent Regiment, deposed that all the prisoners belonged to his company. On the day in question he was late for dinner, and while taking dinner his attention was drawn to a number of men over the *nullah*, some with coats some without. He shouted to them to go back to barracks. He repeated the order and the men dispersed. He went to the crest of the hill till he could see into the *nullah*. Before he got below the crest Private Horricks was arrested. He saw the woman, who did not move. She did not appear dazed. She did not speak or cry. He formed the impression that a large number of men, from twenty to forty, had been concerned in the affair. He was ordered to make enquiries. He recognised Private Goff as on the scene, and got the names of others—Sullivan, now a witness for the prosecution; Thorpe, the present accused; also the names of all the other accused except Martin. All these men had been summoned to give evidence for the defence of Private Horricks, but were not called. He never saw women soliciting men in barracks. He heard from two privates shortly before Private Horricks' trial that a woman had danced in barracks on the day in question. He admitted making a mistake in swearing to the Cantonment Magistrate on April 28 that he made no enquiries into the case.

Twenty-three witnesses have now been examined, and twenty-one more remain.

August 31.

At the resumed hearing of the Rangoon outrage case to-day further evidence was called.

In cross-examination, Inspector Hewitt was asked if the Adjutant of the West Kent Regiment gave him Sullivan's statement ten or twelve days after the occurrence. He denied this. He said the Adjutant came and talked over the case between ten and fourteen days after the occurrence. The Adjutant never communicated to him that Sullivan had seen some men at the place. Re-examined he said the Adjutant told him they had evidence which showed that Horricks was innocent. He swore positively the Adjutant did not

give him a written statement, nor show him one. The Adjutant mentioned no names during the conversation.

A Native police constable said he assisted in picking up the woman. Her clothes were not torn in pieces, as asserted by other constables.

Private John Sullivan, examined, said he saw the woman singing and dancing on April 2 near C Company barracks and making indecent gestures. She then went away. She crossed the ditch and went on to the public road. Coomber, one of the accused, left his dinner and followed her. Four or five minutes afterwards Johnson, Thorpe, Martin, Goff, Boulter and witness followed. They met Coomber returning. Johnson asked where the woman was, and Coomber pointed towards the nullah. Johnson then went to the woman. Later Corporal Rodgers, Martin and Thorpe shifted the woman into the nullah. Then Thorpe, Martin, Rodgers and Goff in this order went with the woman. The witness did not touch her. At this time about forty or fifty other men assembled. Private Atkins had an old rusty pioneer sword. Some of the soldiers present threw stones at the Burmese. Witness did not know who threw stones. He left when Horricks was arrested. Witness made a statement to the Adjutant ten days after the occurrence. That statement was not true. He made an untrue statement, because he had been threatened and assaulted. At the identification parade, Atkins, Clark and the witness were identified as being present at the nullah. Witness then got afraid, and when Colour-Sergeant Macdonald questioned him he told what he knew. Then he was knocked about by the men.

Sullivan, in cross-examination, said certain false statements he made to the Adjutant were made at the instigation of Corporal Nurse and others.

A long cross-examination ensued, directed to the past life of Sullivan; the allegation being that he had been in the pay of Metropolitan detectives in the Borough before he joined the regiment. He denied this.

Corporal Nurse was recalled and admitted that Sullivan accompanied him and Horricks to the police station, but denied that Sullivan told him Horricks was guilty and that he (Nurse) dissuaded him from giving evidence.

September 2.

In connexion with the charge against soldiers of the West Kent Regiment, Friday was occupied in arguing the admissibility of the statements made by the soldiers to their officers and to the Court of Inquiry. Counsel for the defence, to show the inducement held out to the men, called Major Morse, commanding the regiment at the time, and remarked that the same inducement was held out subsequently by Captain Burt. Major Morse said the seven accused were brought before him on June 13. Sullivan was produced as evidence against each. He spoke to each accused to this effect: "It will be better for you and the regiment to speak the truth." Then he stated the case against them, continuing, "If this woman is proved to be a prostitute there is no crime committed; if, on the other hand, it is proved you committed rape, you are liable to twenty years."—To Mr. Fox: He did not consider he was holding out any inducement to the men to confess. He added that he told no one of this previously. He did not mention it at the Court of Inquiry, or to the Commissioner of Police.

September 5.

The hearing of the outrage case was resumed to-day, and the Recorder passed orders on the admissibility of the statements made to regimental officers and the Court of Inquiry, refusing to admit them on the ground that Major Morse, a person in authority, had held out inducements to the accused to make the statements in question.

In the course of his judgment, the Recorder having gone over the facts as to the soldiers being brought before Major Morse, said the effect of the promptings of Major Morse and Captain Burt were most apparent, for while all the accused had preserved complete silence until June 13, on that day their tongues were at once loosened. It must be carefully noted, continued the judge, that in the exhortation of both officers the suggestion that Mah Goon was a prostitute found a prominent place. Later on the judge quoted the Queen's Regulations to show that Commanding Officers were to use every effort to prevent crime and suppress any tendency to screen its existence. The Commanding Officer was bound by the regulations to report to the police crime brought to his cognisance. From such duty the result followed that Major Morse was unquestionably a person having authority over the accused in connexion with this case, and any confession made to him under inducement, threat, or promise was irrelevant. The judge then examined the authorities as to whether Major Morse's words were an inducement, and held that they were. The statements were therefore irrelevant.

The case for the prosecution then closed.

Mr. Van Somersen for the defence said he did not propose calling any witnesses.

The accused examined by the Court said he did not wish to make any statement.

Mr. Fox, addressing the Court, said he had hoped to produce satisfactory evidence, first, that the woman had been outraged; secondly, that the present accused was concerned. On the first point complete evidence had been produced, but on the second point he had failed. The evidence of Major Morse was the first indication to any one connected with the prosecution in any way of his having made any statement at all to the accused. It was very unfortunate that what Major Morse stated to the accused was not disclosed before the Cantonment Magistrate. If this had been done there would have been no committal of Thorpe, and much labour and time would have been saved. The question whether this particular accused committed rape or not rested entirely on the evidence of Sullivan. Counsel continued: In opening I told you that I was not putting forward Sullivan as a witness of truth, and his story, as I believed it would be told, would be absolutely inconsistent with the story I ask you to believe on the evidence of Native witnesses. What I said in my opening as regards Sullivan I in no way retract. I emphasise what I said. It must be apparent to you he has lost himself in the maze of the different versions he has given. The question was, he continued, whether as reasonable men the jury could act upon Sullivan's statements. Sullivan must be regarded in the light of an accomplice, and in a case of such gravity counsel could not ask them to accept his evidence without corroboration. Counsel concluded: I do not ask you to act in any spirit of vindictiveness or from a feeling that because a crime has been committed somebody must be punished. It would be shocking indeed to suggest that, and for a jury of Englishmen to be capable of acting thus. If you think as reasonable men you cannot possibly act on Sullivan's statement, possibly or probably there will be a failure of justice, but the responsibility for that failure does not rest upon you or upon me. It is occasioned by the present state of the law.

Counsel for the defence did not address the jury.

The Recorder having summed up, the jury at 1.45 p.m. acquitted the accused man, Thorpe. They added a rider as follows: The evidence proves clearly that the crime of rape was committed by a number of men of the West Kent Regiment. We exceedingly regret that sufficient evidence is not forthcoming to convict the guilty parties. The jury unanimously endorse the remarks made by the learned Recorder and the Government Advocate regretting that the evidence of Major Morse was not brought to the notice of the prosecution earlier.

ACQUITTAL OF ALL THE ACCUSED.

Last week we printed telegrams reporting the acquittal of the first three soldiers who were tried on this charge. A Reuter's telegram, dated Rangoon September 22, stated that "the trial before the Sessions Court of the remaining four men of the West Kent Regiment, Privates Rodgers, Coombe, Boulter and Goff, on the charge of outraging a Burmese woman, has resulted in the discharge of the accused."

SOME OPINIONS OF THE BRITISH PRESS.

The *Times* of Tuesday last printed the following telegram (dated September 25) from its own correspondent at Simla:—The decision of the Recorder of Rangoon to discharge the remainder of the accused in the notorious Rangoon outrage case adds one more to the surprises with which this astounding investigation has abounded. After the acquittal of Private Johnson last week, and after the Recorder's ruling that the statements made by the accused to officers were inadmissible as evidence, no jury could be expected to convict the remaining prisoners, who had made no such admissions as Johnson did. Accordingly, if the participators in the crime are not to escape with absolute impunity, the only course now open is for the military authorities to have resort to severe disciplinary action. Such action, I have good reason to believe, is contemplated at army headquarters, and the only result of the decision of the Recorder of Rangoon must be to prevent prompt steps from being taken, as this finding leaves it uncertain whether the civil authorities have finally abandoned the case.

On a comprehensive review of the case it is difficult to say whether the investigation has suffered more from the culpable remissness of the civil police in the initial stages, from the extraordinary apathy of the regimental authorities, or from freaks in legal interpretation, such as the decision of the cantonment magistrate that statements made before a military court of enquiry are not protected, or the not less extraordinary decision of the Recorder that officers who advise men suspected of an atrocious crime to confess the truth, pointing out simultaneously the penalty of guilt, are exercising an influence which renders the statements inadmissible as evidence. These vagaries in judicial interpretation will doubtless be set right by the authorities chiefly concerned, but the deplorable fact remains that an almost unparalleled combination of negligence and incompetence on the part of the investigating and judicial authorities has resulted in a gross miscarriage of justice.

The Bombay correspondent of the *Star* telegraphed on Friday last (September 22):—

There is great indignation here at the acquittal of the West Kent soldiers for the Rangoon outrage. The *Bombay Gazette* writes: "The scoundrels have disgraced their uniform. There is a conspiracy to screen the perpetrators of the unspeakable atrocity. In America the

scoundrels concerned in the foulest crime of the century would be lynched." Other Anglo-Indian papers are just as strong on the matter.

The *Westminster Gazette* wrote on Tuesday (September 26):—

The Rangoon scandal continues a scandal still. The remainder of the accused have been discharged, and it looks almost as if the matter was to be finally hushed up. There is no need to repeat details of the abominable outrage which was committed, or to set forth what is regarded on the spot as the blundering and supineness on the part of the authorities. In the opinion of the *Times* correspondent at Simla, "the deplorable fact remains that an almost unparalleled combination of negligence and incompetence on the part of the investigating and judicial authorities has resulted in a gross miscarriage of justice." At the moment there is some doubt as to whether the civil authorities have finally abandoned the case or not; but it is be hoped there may yet be some means of bringing the guilty to justice. There is still, we are afraid, among certain circles in the East an opinion that an outrage on a Native is not an outrage at all. That opinion requires to be finally and completely stamped out.

The *Manchester Guardian* (September 27) said:—A Reuter's telegram has announced the acquittal of the four remaining men of the Royal West Kent Regiment who were charged with outraging a respectable Burmese woman at Rangoon. All the six accused soldiers have now been acquitted; the prosecution has thus failed to bring home the responsibility for this gross crime, committed in open day and close to the barracks, although such a result is not unusual in cases where a number of men are more or less implicated, some by active participation in an outrage and others by silence and non-interference, and all alike refuse at first to give information to the authorities. In such cases, when through the application of strong pressure witnesses are at last forthcoming, their evidence is generally too untrustworthy for any convictions to be safely founded upon it. The witnesses no doubt describe with fair accuracy what they saw, but it is very easy to substitute the name of an unpopular comrade for that of a guilty friend. And evidence for the defence is too often equally available whether the accused is innocent or guilty. It taxes the utmost skill of specially trained and experienced judges to weigh aright the testimony in such cases, and juries, however honestly desirous they may be of doing full justice, want this practised skill. Anglo-Indian juries have a bad name for acquitting accused Englishmen, and in some measure they have deserved this ill report; but to a great extent the failures of justice which have occurred are due to the difficulty of the task set them. The young English magistrate is taught that he must not reject the whole story of a witness because some part of it is clearly exaggerated and distorted; he has to learn how to separate the true part of the story from the additions by which the witness foolishly thinks to strengthen his testimony; but a jury is easily led by an able counsel for the defence to condemn impatiently the whole evidence as too rotten a basis for a conviction. And so from time to time notorious crimes go unpunished. In this Rangoon case there is no reason, on the information at present available, to think that the verdicts of acquittal were perverse; the jurors probably found it impossible to convict on the doubtful and conflicting evidence before them. But there was clear proof of a scandalous and semi-public outrage, and if it has been impossible to ascertain with certainty the individual criminals, the shame of this fact is almost greater than that of the crime itself. Lord Curzon, it is believed, has insisted on the fullest possible enquiry into the whole facts of the case; it is to be hoped that he will find some way to bring home to the whole battalion their corporate responsibility for this disgraceful outrage.

The *Morning Leader* wrote (September 27):—The Rangoon scandal has excited the indignation even of that highly official person, the Simla correspondent of the *Times*. He describes the affair, indeed, as "a gross miscarriage of justice" and denounces in unsparing terms the "culpable remissness of the civil police," the "extraordinary apathy of the regimental authorities," and various "freaks in legal interpretation." There can be no doubt that the case is as bad as bad can be. A respectable Burmese woman was outraged by a considerable number of British soldiers, in the presence of many more, yet nobody has been punished for the crime. One wonders whether anything further would have been heard of the matter if our Bombay correspondent had not promptly telegraphed news of the occurrence to this country. The Indian papers to hand by the last mail give a report of the trial of the first of the seven accused soldiers. He was, like his comrades, acquitted. But the jury added to their verdict a significant rider expressing their profound regret that, while there was no doubt that the outrage had been perpetrated, there was not adequate evidence to convict an individual. When Lord Stanley of Alderley recently called attention in the House of Lords to the increasing frequency of assaults upon Natives by Europeans in India, officials and ex-officials were content to reply that there could not be many assaults as there were so few convictions. Here we see as plainly as possible the futility of this criterion. The last Indian papers to hand also report a case in which the stud groom to the Governor of Bombay assaulted a Native. The Native died. But the groom was found guilty only of inflicting simple hurt, and was let off with a fine of twenty-five rupees—a little over thirty shillings! Probably the new army order which has been issued in India will do something to diminish the number of assaults upon Natives. But for the real remedy we must go deeper. Tommy Atkins and people like him cannot reasonably be expected to treat with decency people whom their official superiors are known to despise.

Sir W. W. Hunter will be absent during October as the representative of the University of Oxford at the Congress of Orientalists in Rome.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, September 9.

The resignation, in a body, of twenty-eight Municipal Commissioners of the Calcutta Corporation has created a deep impression all over the country. The incident is unprecedented in the annals of local self-government in India, and it should convey a painful lesson to our rulers if they are wise enough to take it to heart. An alien Government like that of British India should be the last to hurl reckless and unfounded insinuations against the probity of representative men who for years have been endeavouring to manage the Civic finances of the Capital of the Empire with a zeal, devotion and disinterestedness which claim the highest admiration. Yet these are the men whose personal characters are attacked, whose motives are impugned, and whose integrity is suspected. When the accused persons demand proof of the allegations, they are met with a stern and haughty non-possumus which is the insolence of office carried to the point of exasperation. And this is the Government which is not slow to admonish the public from time to time to desist from attributing motives to itself in the conduct of affairs! But such behaviour is common in the bureaucracy which loves to call itself "distinguished". Meanwhile the conduct of the twenty-eight stalwarts has been a subject of eulogy in the Indian Press. Their courage and independence are admired. They have shown that they are no crouching slaves. The mode they adopted was the only possible one, and high praise is due to them for the determination with which they have acted.

Of course we do not expect that there will be a revolution because of the resignation, nor will the Government climb down from its perch. To make even the slightest change in the conduct of the Administration would be an admission of weakness, and how can a Government strong in its own strength humiliate itself by doing what is right? No, the heavens may fall, but woe to the Administration that acknowledges an error in public. That is the ethics which the civilised and Christian Government of the country teaches its subjects. It is such conduct that irritates people and sometimes drives them to exasperation. Who is to be blamed if under such circumstances the seeds of discontent are sown broadcast? Yet the authorities are so short-sighted that they will not perceive causes that lie on the surface—the causes which go to create dissatisfaction in the country and impair the attachment of the people to their rulers. It is much to be regretted that in this matter the astute bureaucracy at Simla has led the Viceroy into error. Evidently Lord Curzon meant well. But somehow he was betrayed into taking action on misstatements of facts, which has led to this unhappy result.

The Currency Bill was introduced in the Imperial Council yesterday with a great flourish of trumpets from the Viceroy, whose speech tells us what a new recruit he is in Indian finance and currency. Foreign politics is one thing. Banking and finance is another. But our Viceroy is too ambitious. He thinks that on the stage of Indian Administration he can play many parts, and that all the parts must be brilliant and dazzling. He will soon learn that after all the Government of India is not a bed of roses. When the thorns prick him he will grow wiser. Meanwhile it is extraordinary that after all the fuss and expense of the Currency Committee, it is now announced that silver will be legal tender to an unlimited extent. Of course gold is the standard, but for internal purposes silver will hold its own. Are we not entitled to enquire: "Then why all this loud cry for a change of currency?" Is it for the sake of bringing equilibrium into the annual finances that the change has been introduced? Is it for the sake of assisting foreign trade, mostly in the hands of alien exploiters? The authorities answer in the affirmative. But the answer condemns the new measure. For if after all one is not able to alter the huge silver currency of 150 crores, what becomes of all the loud cry about a change? It is clear, however, that the Government is at its wits' end about future finance. On the one hand it still thinks of increasing its military expenditure (though curbed for the moment). On the other hand it is bent upon railway construction at a breathless pace. Above and beyond these measures it is borrowing afresh. Practically this means increased expenditure. The so-called "savings" in exchange will soon be swallowed up. Embarrassments will be chronic as before, and not even a gold currency will drive them away, though it is notorious that it is for this special purpose—to meet fresh expenditure on sterling remittances—that the new nostrum has been called into existence. How short-sighted are these men in brief authority and power! Little do they care what may be the consequences of their new measure. Little do they reck what the far-reaching effects may be on the economic condition of the people. Sufficient for the day if they can indulge in their frontier fireworks, in their railways, and in their other fads, if only sterling remittances do not demand a larger number of rupees. Such a policy is foredoomed to failure. No currency will cure the evils arising out of the mischievous policy which entails that expenditure. So that practically they will be compelled, willy-

nilly, if not now a quarter of a century hence, to change their policy. But as it is the Viceroy is jubilant. His platitudes and glowing eulogium on the new measure only excite our smiles. But who can oppose the will of our Indian Cæsars when they are bent upon carrying their measures by hook or by crook?

THE DANGER IN AFGHANISTAN.

[From the "Englishman."]

At the present moment, when we are preparing to detach a large portion of the British garrison in India for service in South Africa, disturbing rumours from Afghanistan possess a very serious and special significance. Not a Kafila filters down the Khyber Pass but brings idle and lying tales to fill the ears of the gossip-mongers in the Peshawar bazaars, and it is, therefore, unwise to attach much importance to every transfrontier rumour. But two items of news from Kabul that have recently found currency must be causing some misgiving in Simla. We have, in the first place, the report, published in the Continental papers and repeated on their authority in the *Times*, that a Russian emissary is at present in the Afghan capital negotiating for the extension of the Khushk railway into the Amír's territories. Again there is the news just telegraphed from Lahore that a fresh rebellion has broken out in Afghan Turkestan, and that severe fighting has already taken place. Our Simla correspondent telegraphs that the report is not believed there, because it would argue Russian connivance. There are others who would put faith in the story for this very reason. As regards the Russian Agent we do not believe Abdur Rahman would for a moment entertain any ideas of railway extension from the North, or for that matter even take any public notice of the foreigner's presence in the city. But all who have any knowledge of the Amír's court are aware of the atmosphere of intrigue which surrounds it, and of recent years Abdur Rahman has been growing more and more secret and crafty in his conduct of State affairs. . . .

But setting aside the story of the Russian Agent, there is room for the gravest conjecture regarding the possibilities of a rebellion in Turkestan. There is no doubt that the Amír is hated throughout his dominions, and that strange exodus of Pathans from the Ghuznavi district into India which has been attracting attention of recent years is entirely due to his lawless exactions. No man's life or property is safe in Afghanistan. Afghans themselves are wild and turbulent, hard to govern, and doubtless pay more respect to a stern than to a benevolent ruler. But there are limits to despotism. From all accounts Abdur Rahman has been exceeding those limits. In his later years he has grown savagely intolerant of advice from his courtiers, suspicious of his friends, and miserly in the extreme. Withal he is in failing health. A rebellion therefore at the present moment is likely to have popular support, especially if initiated in those outlying regions where the terror of his presence cannot overawe the sufferers from his exactions. His own troops are not to be relied on, for he will not pay them. The Muhamad Ismail Khan who is now said to have raised the standard of revolt is the son of Isa Khan, the Amír's first cousin, who in 1888 challenged the Amír's authority. That rebellion was put down with a ruthless and terrible hand. Indeed so awful was the slaughter carried out among Isa's followers and those whom Abdur Rahman suspected of sympathising with them that the Government of India was constrained to send a warning letter that such proceedings could not be tolerated from a ruler who was under British protection. The Amír sent back the curt reply that the only possible way of dealing with rebellious subjects was to make it impossible for them to repeat the offence, and the matter was allowed to drop. It is significant that a second rising should be said to have started in the very region where Abdur Rahman had so glutted his vengeance.

Now the Government of India is deeply concerned in keeping Abdur Rahman on the throne. In the first place we are bound to do so under treaty obligations. Whatever may be the exact conditions under which the Amir was placed in Kabul the whole tenor of our relations with Afghanistan since the last war shows that some offensive-defensive alliance exists. Abdur Rahman certainly believes that he can count upon English help in the event of trouble with his subjects. In the first days of Isa's rebellion the Amír sent off an urgent appeal to Simla for help, asking for troops to be pushed forward to Chaman, Kurram, and Landi Kotal with a view to the occupation if necessary of Kandahar, Ghuzni, and Jellalabad. Indeed, he was willing to allow Kandahar to be occupied at once. However, the back of the rebellion was broken before the Government took any steps. Supposing the Amír were again to make the same request. The British would be in a most awkward dilemma. If they refused not only would they be breaking their pledged word, but Abdur Rahman might be torn from his throne, and succeeded by one with active Russian sympathies, for the whole of Isa Khan's family have hitherto been living across the Oxus, recipients of Russian hospitality. Again if a rebellion dragged on for some years an excuse would be offered the Russians for interference, for they might very well say that it was impossible to tolerate a continued state of warfare just across their frontiers. Many politicians are prone to forget that nowadays the Russian frontier does march alongside Afghanistan. But supposing that we interfered, we should be interfering to retain on the throne a man hated and detested by his subjects, and that fact would not be forgotten when the Amír dies, an event that may happen any day. Could we then by any means induce the Afghans to believe that we were friendly towards them, and would they then support the Amír's son if they suspected him of pro-English leanings? The situation, therefore, is full of danger, and emphasises the necessity of careful deliberation before the British garrison in India is reduced, for however short a period.

THE INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE.

The following are declared by the Civil Service Commissioners to have obtained the first eighty-three places in the recent open competitive examination for the above services. The letters H., I., C. show the services (Home, Indian, Colonial) for which the candidates have entered their names. Upon the final allocation of the candidates higher on the list will depend the ultimate position of those represented only by the numbers which they bore in the examination. The selection of every candidate is conditional on his passing a medical examination, which will be held in London in the course of a few days:—

Name (or Number).	Total Marks.
Cyril Norwood (H.)	4,366
Walter Frederic Nicholson (H.I.C.)	3,668
Roland Venables Vernon (H.)	3,578
Cecil Clementi (H.C.)	3,440
Frederic Herbert Williamson (H.)	3,429
James Young Bell (H.I.)	3,389
Alan Frederic Fremantle (H.I.)	3,091
Alexander Flint (H.I.C.)	3,068
Peter William Monie (H.I.)	2,980
Harry Llewelyn Lyons Allanson (H.I.C.)	2,963
Adelbert William James Talbot (H.I.)	2,950
Robert Charles Steuart Keith (H.I.)	2,932
James Paterson Brander (H.I.)	2,923
Arthur Mario Agricola Collier Galletti di Cadilhac (I.)	2,921
John Archibald Ross (H.I.C.)	2,917
Reginald Edward Stubbs (H.I.C.)	2,892
James Toplis (H.I.)	2,854
William Le Bas Tahourdin (H.I.C.)	2,852
236 (H.)	2,849
Charles Hugh Blathwayt (H.I.C.)	2,840
270 (H.)	2,816
John Loader Maffey (H.I.C.)	2,750
Robert William Davies (H.I.C.)	2,748
John Troyte Griffith (H.I.C.)	2.747
Henry Alexander Smith (H.I.C.)	2,720
John Chartres Molony (H.I.C.)	2,703
David Thomas Chadwick (H.I.C.)	2,693
Edward Henry Berthoud (H.I.C.)	2,677
Felix Martin Levi (H.I.C.)	2,662
Alexander Marr (H.I.C.)	2,630
Wilfrid Wilmot Smart (H.I.C.)	2,628
George Ernest Lambourn (H.I.C.)	2,615
Charles Morden Collett (H.I.C.)	2,598
William Stalkarth Morrison (H.I.C.)	2,553
Vyvyan Macleod Ferrers (H.I.C.)	2,532
Reginald James Gresham Clive Paterson (H.C.)	2,531
William Stanley Milne (H.I.C.)	2,512
248 (H.)	2,505
John Edward Hance (H.I.)	2,477
Geoffrey Fitzhervey de Montmorency (H.I.C.)	2,470
246 (H.)	2,469
243 (H.C.)	2,468
William Aitkenhead Doig (H.I.C.)	2,463
Evelyn Berkeley Howell (H.I.)	2,459
Philip Perceval Graves (H.I.C.)	2,446
Henry Ronald-Taylor Simpson Perrott (H.I.C.)	2,420
Charles Edward Dansey Peters (I.)	2,389
John Ernest Buttery Hotson (H.I.)	2,377
Abraham James Lainé (H.I.C.)	2,364
Jotindra Nath Roy (H.I.C.)	2,362
Jogindra Nath Pal (I.)	2,360
268 (H.)	2,352
Charles William Dunn (H.I.C.)	2,335
240 (H.C.)	2,327
Donald James Boyd (I.C.)	2,309
Claude Gordon Hendersan (H.I.C.)	2,302
Ralph Reynolds Garlick (H.I.C.)	2,300
Richard French Laurence Whitty (H.I.C.)	2,297
Harold Hamilton Burkitt (H.I.)	2,285
Everard Reginald Neave (I.)	2,247
John Hugo Hepburn Bill (I.)	2,214
Cecil Pownall Browne (H.I.)	2,204
Rajappaya Narayana Aiyar (H.I.C.)	2,189
Samuel Watt (H.I.C.)	2,164
235 (H.C.)	2,162
George Arthur Thomas (I.)	2.157
David Richie (H.I.C.)	2,141
Edward Hope Waterfield (H.I.C.)	2,138
244 (H.)	2,117
Wilfrid Alder (H.I.C.)	2,115
228 (H.)	2,114
Malcolm Caird McAlpin (H.I.C.)	2,109
260 (H.)	2,098
Balak Ram (H.I.C.)	2,095
Frederick William Rowntree Robertson (H.I.C.)	2,094
Hugh Arthur Lomas (H.I.C.)	2,088
147 (H.I.)	2,078
Bernhard Hermann Richardson (H.I.C.)	2,074
267 (H.)	2,072
Bernard Joseph Dutton (H.I.C.)	2,062
127 (I.)	2,039
Edward Brandis Danham (H.I.C.)	2,032
232 (H.)	2,026

The following stand next in order of merit:—

No. 98 (I.)	2,019
No. 224 (I.C.)	2,017
No. 83 (H.I.C.)	2'008
No. 223 (H.I.C.)	2,006
No. 160 (H.I.C.)	1,996

ASSAULT FOLLOWED BY DEATH.

"RUPTURE OF THE SPLEEN" AGAIN.

FINE OF TWENTY-FIVE RUPEES.

Henry Wilson, stud groom to his Excellency the Governor of Bombay, was charged at Poona on September 1 before Mr. Aston, Sessions Judge, and three assessors, under Sections 304 (*a*) and 323 Indian Penal Code, with having caused the death of Syce Bapoo Raoji on the night of August 19, and also with causing simple hurt.

Mr. Ramchunder, Public Prosecutor, and Inspector Moore appeared for the prosecution, and Messrs. Leslie Crawford and Xavier for the defence. The prosecution did not press the charge under Section 304 (*a*), as the evidence of all the witnesses went to show that the deceased was slapped on the head. The accused in his statement before the committing magistrate had admitted striking him. The evidence recorded was much the same as that taken at the preliminary trial. The father of the deceased and another syce were examined. The latter gave evidence to show that on the night in question the accused, being angry at the pony being loose, gave deceased several slaps on his head. He picked up his *puggaree* and ran to catch the pony. When he came up he was leaning on the animal's neck, and fell down and died in a quarter of an hour or so.

Dr. Sabnis, assistant-surgeon, Sassoon Hospital, repeated his former evidence about the deceased's death being due to rupture of the spleen, and that such rupture, in his opinion, would cause faintness and death, though a man might continue his work one minute after the rupture.

A number of witnesses were offered for cross-examination, which was declined by the defence. The two assessors gave it as their opinion that there was grave and sudden provocation. The third acquitted the accused. The Judge, finding the accused guilty of causing simple hurt, fined him Rs. 25.—The *Times of India*.

SINGER'S SEWING MACHINES.

FOR CASH OR HIRE.

Machines Exchanged and Repaired.

DUPLICATE PARTS, NEEDLES, OIL, &c., ALWAYS IN STOCK.

100 Offices in India, Burma, and Ceylon.

Instructions Free. *Price Lists Free on application.*

The SINGER Manufacturing Co. } **5, CHURCH GATE ST., BOMBAY.**

MAHA-BHARATA,

Condensed into English Verse by ROMESH DUTT, C.I.E.

Cheap Edition (*Temple Classics Series*) **Cloth, 1s. 6d., Leather, 2s.**

Edition de Luxe, with an Introduction by the Right Hon. Professor MAX MULLER, and 12 Photogravures from Indian Sources by Miss E. S. HARDY, Cloth 12s. 6d., Parchment 15s. Publishers, DENT & CO., London.

May be had in India through any Indian bookseller.

OPINIONS.

"The impression which his bold undertaking leaves on the reader is certainly that something like what we here read in English may have been recited in India when the war between the Kurus and the sons of Pandu was first sung by the ancient bards of the country." *Prof. Max Muller's Introduction.*

"Mr. Romesh Chandra Dutt is the first scholar who brings to his task a life-long study of the original, with a perfect command of our own language. . . . Puts into vigorous verse the episodes which are still recited in thousands of quiet hamlets, and hundreds of crowded estivals."—*The Times.*

"An interesting Epilogue by the translator further explains the history and scope of the work, and furnishes an instance of the marvellous command of English acquired by educated Bengali gentlemen. The wisdom of the East is worthily presented in attractive binding and printing."—*The Saturday Review.*

"If the Epic could not attract European readers by its intrinsic merits—its noble moral conceptions, its encyclopædic pictures of Indian civilisation in the remote past, its pathos,—its delineation of character—still its extraordinary popularity and influence, as described in the translator's eloquent 'Epilogue,' should alone make us curious to learn something of the story of the Kurus and the God-like sons of Pandu."—*The Manchester Guardian.*

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., President.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,

Soho Square, National Hospital, London, W.

"INDIA," Jan.-June, 1899.

VOL. XI.

NOW READY.

Bound in Cloth (post free) 7/6 each net cash.

The following volumes of "India," bound in cloth, can also be obtained :—

Vols. V. (1894), VI. (1895), VII. (1896), VIII. (1897). Price 8/6 each, post free.

Vols. IX. (Jan.-June, 1898), X. (July-Dec., 1898). Price 7/6 each, post free.

Remittances should accompany order.

Apply to the Manager, "India,"

84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

Congress Addresses and Resolutions from the first to 1898.

INDIAN POLITICS.

With an Introduction by W. C. BONNERJEE, Esq., Bar.-at-Law.

Price in India, Rs. 2; in England, 4s. (postage 4d. extra).

PART I.—**Original Articles.**

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS. Eardley Norton, Esq., Bar.-at-Law.
ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE OF INDIA. Rao Bahadur R. N. Mudholkar, B.A., LL.B.
INDIAN ASPIRATIONS UNDER BRITISH RULE. Romesh Chunder Dutt, Esq., C.I.E.
INDIA AND THE CURRENCY QUESTION. Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq.
THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT QUESTION. John Adam, Esq., M.A., Bar.-at-Law.
THE POVERTY OF INDIA. Alfred Nundy, Esq., Bar.-at-Law.
LINES OF LEGISLATION IN INDIA. P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyar, Esq., B.A., B.L.
THE JURY SYSTEM IN INDIA. Sorab Pestonji N. Wadia, Esq.,
THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN INDIA. V. Krishnaswami Aiyar, Esq., B.A., B.I.
THE STATUS OF INDIANS ABROAD. G. Parameswaran Pillay, Esq., B.A.
RAILWAYS IN INDIA. G. Subramania Aiyar, Esq., B.A.

PART II.—**All the past 13 Congress Presidential Addresses.**

PART III.—**All the past Congress Resolutions.**

In India—Apply to G. A. NATESAN & Co., Publishers, Esplanade, Madras.
In Great Britain—Apply to The Manager of "India,"
84-85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.
Remittances must accompany order.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

Dr. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., New Medical Hall, Meerut.

is what its name implies FEVER DESTROYER,

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know
C. E. Wood, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there more than magic in it.
G. L. Narsinga Row.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I ave much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,
C. S. Srinivasa, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "India," should be made to

The Manager,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliot Stock, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.